



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/826,926	04/06/2001	Makoto Shiotsu	21.1992/WMS	3616
21171	7590	11/30/2004	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			SHORTLEDGE, THOMAS E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2654	

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/826,926	SHIOTSU ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Thomas E Shortledge	2654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 05/01/2001.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Fig. 6 is disclosed on page 17; however, no Fig. 6 is present in the drawings.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sukehiro et al. (JP06103306A).

As to claim 1, Sukehiro et al. teach:

a translation receiving device (file management means) receiving a source document to be translated, splitting the source document (dividing) into specified units of text, producing translation control information (operating conditions) corresponding to the respective specified units and requesting translation of the text, (the file

management means fetches the original sentence files, and dividing the files by searching for the punctuation code from the input, detecting the operating conditions, and finding the translation of the input, paragraphs 17 and 18); and a translation device receiving the text from the translation receiving device, and translating the text using the translation control information (translation executing means executes the translation of the original sentence and outputs the translated sentence files, using the operating conditions, paragraph 18).

As to claim 2, Sukehiro et al. teach:

the translating device sends results of the translation of the units of text to the translation-receiving device, (the file management means combines the translated sentence to create an output, (paragraphs 18 and 19). It would be inherent that the translating device would send the results to the file management means so it is able to combine the translated sentence files.)

the translation receiving device receives the results of the translation of the respective units of text, and integrates the results of translation of the units of texts to generate translated text of the source document (the file management means combines the translated sentence to create an output, (paragraphs 18 and 19).

As to claim 3, Sukehiro et al. teach the translation-receiving device receives a plurality of source documents, splits the respective source documents into units of text, and requests the translation of the units of text of the source documents, (the file

management means fetches the original sentence files, divides the sentence files, then requests translation of the divided files, paragraph 18).

As to claim 4, Sukehiro et al. teach the translation-receiving device comprises document identifying information and sentence identifying information, and the translation-receiving device integrates the translation results of the source document and distinguishes the source document based on the document identifying information, sentence identifying information and the translation results, (the original sentence along with the sentence identification information such as the position information of the original sentence are added to the information sent to the translation executing means, paragraph 17).

As to claims 5, 7, and 10, Sukehiro et al. teach:

a computer readable storage medium storing a program (the translation process is realizable on a workstation or a personal computer, (paragraph 15). It would be inherent that the workstation or a personal computer would contain a storage medium storing a program.).

a splitting device splitting a document to be translated into sentences of specified units (dividing the inputted sentence files based on the punctuation codes, paragraph 17);

a requesting device including translation control information, the requesting device requesting translation of the sentences and the translation control information,

(a file management means provides the operating conditions of the original sentence along with the original sentence to the translation executing means for translation, paragraph 18); and

a translation device sequentially translating the respective sentences with translation control information (the translation executing means, translates the original sentences along with their operating conditions, (paragraph 18). It would be inherent that the translation would be completed sequentially as the sentences were supplied to the translation executing means).

As to claim 6, Sukehiro et al. teach:

a splitting device splitting a source document into sentences of specified units (dividing the inputted sentence files based on the punctuation codes, paragraph 17);

a translation receiving device comprising translation control information, the translation requesting device requesting the translation of the split sentences with the translation control information (a file management means provides the operating conditions of the original sentence along with the original sentence to the translation executing means for translation, paragraph 18);

a plurality of translation devices respectively translating sentences using translation control information corresponding to each of the sentences received from the translation receiving device (each translation-executing means receives the operating conditions, and translates the original sentence, (paragraph 18 and 21). Where the word each suggests numerous translation-executing means.)

As to claims 8 and 9, Sukehiro et al. teach:

a computer readable storage medium storing a program (the translation process is realizable on a workstation or a personal computer, (paragraph 15). It would be inherent that the workstation or a personal computer would contain a storage medium storing a program.)

a receiving device receiving a source text and translation control information corresponding to the source text (a file managements fetches the original sentence and detects the operating conditions, paragraph 18); and

a translation device translating the received source text by modifying the source text during translation using the translation control information corresponding to the source text (a translation executing means that is supplied with the operating conditions, translates the original sentence, (paragraph 18). It would inherent that the translation executing means would use the operating conditions to modify the original sentence.)

As to claim 11, Sukehiro et al. teach the translation means comprises a plurality of translation means respectively sentences using translation control information corresponding to each of the sentences received from the translation receiving device, (each translation-executing means receives the operating conditions, and translates the original sentence, (paragraph 18 and 21), where the word "each" indicates numerous translation-executing means.)

As to claim 12, Sukehiro et al. teach:

a translation requesting device including text to be translated, the requesting device communicating the text to be translated and a translation request (a file management means that obtains an original sentence file, and a translation executing means for translating the original sentence file, paragraph 18);

a splitting device receiving the text to be translated and splitting the text to be translated into separate units of text based on splitting information stored therein, (a file dividing means, divides the original sentence based on the punctuation information code, paragraph 17);

an options seeking device seeking translation options corresponding to the separate units of text, the options seeking device including translation control information used to generate the translation options, (detecting the operating conditions, for each of the original sentences, where the operating conditions give instructions to the file dividing means and translation means, based on the properties of the original sentence, paragraph 18, 19, and 23);

a translation device receiving the separate units of text from the splitting device and the corresponding translation options from the options seeking device and translating the separate units of text based on the corresponding translation options, (the translation executing means, executes the translation on the divided sentences based on the operating conditions of each of the original sentences, paragraph 23);

an integrating device (file combining means) receiving the translated separate units of text and integrating the translated separate units of text into a translated text (a

file combining means combines the translation results of the translation executing means, paragraph 19).

As to claim 13, Sukehiro et al. teach the translation device comprises a plurality of translation devices respectively receiving and translating the separate units of text (each translation-executing means receives the operating conditions, and translates the original sentence, (paragraph 18 and 21), where the word "each" indicates numerous translation-executing means.)

As to claims 14 and 15, Sukehiro et al. teach the options seeking device seeks translation options for a next unit of text to be translated while a previous unit of text is being translated, (the operating conditions of the original sentence are found, and each of the divided original sentences are sequentially transmitted for translation, (paragraph). It would be inherent since each of the sentences are transmitted sequentially, that while one sentence is being translated, the instructions for the next would be found.).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sukehiro et al. in view of Tanabe (JP05002603A)

As to claim 16, Sukehiro et al. teach the text to be translated comprises separate documents (sentence files) and the plurality of translation devices (on or more original sentence files, (paragraph 14), and a plurality of translation devices (paragraph 18).

Sukehiro et al. do not teach translating the separate documents in parallel.

However, Tanabe teaches a parallel translation apparatus, (paragraph 17).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to combine the translation process of Sukehiro et al. with the parallel processing of Tanabe to improve the processing speed of a mechanical translation system.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Kutsumi et al. (5,353,221), Alshawi (6,233,544), Ando et al. (6,523,000), Chong (5,175,684), Takeda et al. (5,477,450), Shiotani et al. (5,093,788), Suzuki et al. (4,894,779), and Doi et al. (4,787,038).

Kutsumi et al. teach a translation machine able to translate an ambiguous parallel disposition of words or phrases.

Alshawi teaches language translation using finite state machines.

Ando et al. teach a method of translation where translation examples are used.

Chong teaches machine translation of inputted text documents.

Takeda et al. teach a machine translation system using parsing, grammar rules, and a dictionary lookup method.

Shiotani et al. teach a translation method that involves splitting and combining sentences to increase the speed of translation.

Suzuki et al. teach translating an input sentence by division and linking.

Doi et al. teach a machine translation system dividing the input sentence then relating the input sentence to a dictionary.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas E Shortledge whose telephone number is (703)605-1199. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Talivaldis Smits can be reached on (703)306-3011. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TS
11/17/2004



RICHMOND DORMIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER